

Remarks

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of various combinations of McCloghrie (U.S. Patent No. 6920112B1), Bergenlid (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0124369 A1), Jannette (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0160811 A1), Sauter (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0209623 A1), Ida (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0082036 A1) and Powers (U.S. Patent No. 6832086 B1).

Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but it was indicated it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, new claim 14 is presented and includes all of the limitations of claim 3 and the base claim. It is submitted that claim 14 is thus allowable.

New claims 15 and 16 include the features of claims 12 and 13 respectively in combination with the features of claim 3. As the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 3, it is submitted that claims 15 and 16 are accordingly also allowable.

Claims 1, 4, 8-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCloghrie in view of Bergenlid.

In the Office Action, it is noted that McCloghrie fails to teach a processor at a wireless telecommunications network node, the processor handling call traffic, and the measurement records being event records that include call events. McCloghrie concerns a network traffic monitoring arrangement. A sampling element selects a fraction of packets for review. The selected packets are placed in a queue for detection by a packet-type detector, for example, to measure the frequency of packets of a selected type or types (McCloghrie, column 2, lines 38 to 61). McCloghrie thus seeks to gain information about network traffic by sampling and analyzing the packets, that is, determining the characteristics of the data transmitted through the network.

In contrast to McCloughrie, the present invention is not concerned with the content or type of the communications traffic transmitted to or received at the network node. As specified in claim 1, the measurement records are event records that include call events, these being events such as denials of call access, drops, handovers and blocked calls. This is a significant difference from the area of concern to McCloughrie. McCloughrie might be of interest to a skilled person wanting to analyze the characteristics of communications traffic content at the node. However, it does not supply any teaching regarding the aspect of call events, where the characteristics of the traffic content are not at issue.

Bergenlid does not rectify this deficiency. Bergenlid discloses a packet-based service which is concerned with detecting packets having longer packet headers and applying processing to reduce any adverse impact on system capacity. Thus, as with McCloughrie, this reference is essentially concerned with the characteristics of the data being transmitted, and not with the recordal of measurement records where the measurement records are event records that include call events. The Examiner cites paragraph 0044, lines 16-26 and paragraph 0045 of Bergenlid as disclosing "the measurements records being event records that include call events". However, the only mention of a call event in these passages, is that, at handover, a lesser amount of header compression is used. There is no disclosure or suggestion of measurement records of call events, as required by claim 1

As neither McCloughrie nor Bergenlid teach the necessary elements for claim 1, claim 1 and dependent claims 4, 8-11 are thus allowable. Independent claim 13 includes the same limitation that the measurement records are event records that include call events and, for the same reasoning as set out above, is thus also allowable.

Claims 2,3,5-7 are each directly or indirectly dependent on allowable claim 1 and thus for this reason at least are also allowable.


Independent claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCloughrie in view of Bergenlid, and further in view of Powers. Bergenlid is again relied on by the Examiner to teach "the

measurements records being event records that include call events", the passages cited with respect to the rejection of claim 1 being repeated in respect of claim 12 and with the addition of a reference to paragraph 0037 of Bergenlid. However, there is no reference in paragraph 0037 of recordal of an event record. The reasoning set out above in respect of claim 1 is thus also relevant to claim 12. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 12 is allowable.

Applicant requests reconsideration of this application based on this amendment. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at 973, 386-8252.

Respectfully submitted,

Isaac Samuel

By 
Stephen M. Gurey
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 27336

Date: July 13, 2006

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Room 3J-219
Holmdel, New Jersey 07733-3030